

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HERMAN TAMRAT,
Plaintiff,

v.

ERICK RHODES, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-01323-PJH](#)

ORDER

Re: Dkt. Nos. 64, 66, 74

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds with a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Presently pending are several miscellaneous motions including an amended motion to compel. The court previously denied plaintiff's original motion to compel without prejudice and informed plaintiff that:

Simply listing the discovery he seeks to compel is insufficient. He must describe which specific discovery requests he seeks to compel, why defendants' responses are insufficient and why he is entitled to the discovery. Before filing an amended motion compel, plaintiff must also meet and confer with defendants to try to resolve their disagreements before seeking court intervention. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a); N.D. Cal. Local Rule 37.

Docket No. 62 at 1.

Plaintiff has failed to follow the court's instructions. He again has listed the numbers of certain discovery requests and seeks the court to compel defendants to provide the discovery. While he includes letters sent from him to defendants and defendants' responses, plaintiff has still failed to argue why defendants' answers are insufficient and why he is entitled to the discovery. These letters are from July and August 2021 and predate several of the court's relevant rulings regarding plaintiff's

1 motions to compel. Plaintiff has also still failed to attempt to meet and confer with
2 defendants since the court's last ruling regarding discovery. Moreover, the court has still
3 reviewed plaintiff's requests and the discovery provided by defendants and finds that the
4 motion to compel lacks merit. For all these reasons the motion to compel (Docket No.
5 66) is **DENIED**.

6 Plaintiff's motions seeking to bar certain videos (Docket Nos. 64, 74) from being
7 reviewed by the court are **DENIED**. The court will review the videos when ruling on the
8 summary judgment motion and address any relevant evidentiary issues in that ruling.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: December 30, 2021

11
12 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

13 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California